

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
CHARLESTON DIVISION**

JOHN DEWESE,	)	C/A No. 2:11-3024 DCN
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	<b><u>ORDER</u></b>
	)	
SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL	)	
CORP.,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

The above referenced case is before this court upon the magistrate judge's recommendation that defendant's motion to dismiss be granted in part and denied in part.

This court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the magistrate judge's report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, absent prompt objection by a dissatisfied party, it appears that Congress did not intend for the district court to review the factual and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge. Thomas v Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Additionally, any party who fails to file timely, written objections to the magistrate judge's report pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) waives the right to raise those objections at the appellate court level. United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 467 U.S. 1208 (1984).<sup>1</sup> Objections to the magistrate judge's report and

---

<sup>1</sup>In Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985), the court held "that a pro se litigant must receive fair notification of the consequences of failure to object to a magistrate judge's report before such a procedural default will result in waiver of the right to appeal. The notice must be 'sufficiently understandable to one in appellant's circumstances fairly to appraise him of what is required.'" Id. at 846. Plaintiff was advised in a clear manner that his objections had to be filed within ten (10) days, and he received notice of the consequences at the

recommendation were timely filed on May 14, 2012.

As to plaintiff's claim for negligent supervision, a de novo review of the record indicates that the magistrate judge's report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. Accordingly, the magistrate judge's report and recommendation is **AFFIRMED IN PART**, and plaintiff's claim for negligent supervision is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.

The court does not adopt the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation as to plaintiff's claim for defamation. Instead, the court holds that plaintiff's defamation claim is **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that defendant's motion to strike the amended complaint is **GRANTED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion to amend the complaint is **DENIED** without prejudice as premature because it was filed before this court could consider the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation.

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED.**



---

David C. Norton  
United States District Judge

May 25, 2012  
Charleston, South Carolina

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified that any right to appeal this Order is governed by Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure

---

appellate level of his failure to object to the magistrate judge's report.